



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/330,056	06/11/1999	KOJI TAKAHARA	0557-4696-2	8925

22850 7590 07/08/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2003

116

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

B

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/330,056

Applicant(s)

TAKAHARA, KOHJI

Examin r

CESAR B PAULA

Art Unit

2178

02

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the CPA filed on 4/14/2003.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. Claims 1-21 are pending in the case. Claims, 1, 8, and 15 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al, hereinafter Wang (Pat.# 5,490,217, 2/6/96), in view of Barnes, "10 Minute Guide to Windows 3.1", SAMS, p.79-83, 1992 have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Priority

4. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), and based on application # 10-179,731 filed in Japan on 6/11/1998, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

5. The formal drawings filed on 9/20/02 have been approved by the draftsman.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The rejections of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment filed on 3/13/2003.

Art Unit: 2178

7. The rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for lacking sufficient antecedent basis in claim 1 have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment filed on 3/13/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lesnick et al, hereinafter Lesnick (Pat.# 4,760,606, 7/26/1988).

Regarding independent claim 1, Lesnick discloses a network of user client workstations linked together in a computer local area network, to a central computer server with a main data storage (col. 4, lines 10-67, fig.2-3).

Moreover, Lesnick discloses a main data storage for storing digitized document images, which are classified into folders in accordance to the user information stored in a header page (col. 4, lines 4-67, and col. 11, lines 11-67).

In addition, Lesnick discloses a document processor for digitizing, and classifying documents based upon the information detected in header pages, which are separate from the document pages (col. 4, lines 27-67, and col. 10, lines 53-col. 11, line 67).

Furthermore, Lesnick discloses the automatic—*not by users*-- digitization of documents, and header pages—*sheet document image information, and sheet of format image information*-- to be input into a main data storage for storing digitized document images, which are classified into folders (col. 3, lines 37-col. 4, line 67, and col. 11, lines 11-67). Lesnick fails to explicitly disclose *an image information server connected to the network and configured to store image information in various folders to be read by the plurality of users*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow users to access the information stored in the folders, because this would enable the users to interact with the main data storage, and retrieve image information pertaining to such individual uses according to the information included in the header pages.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Lesnick teaches a header page describing user associated with a document page(s) to be digitized (col. 4, lines 32-67, fig. 6).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Lesnick discloses the storage of the document pages as a single document in a document file (col. 11, lines 10-44).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 2, Lesnick discloses the scanning and storing into a single file folder all original document pages, from a beginning to an end time period, related to and following a header page (col. 4, lines 24-67, col.11, lines 1-67).

Art Unit: 2178

Claim 5-7, 11-14 is directed towards a computer system for implementing the system found in claim 4, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claims 8-10 are directed towards a computer system for implementing the system found in claims 1-3, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 15-17 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claims 1-3 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 18-21 are directed towards a method for implementing the system found in claim 4, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicants submit that the applied art does not teach a sheet of format information which is followed by document pages as taught in the amended claims (page 5, lines 14-page 6, line 14). The Applicants are directed towards the newly crafted rejections above over a newly found prior art as necessitated by the amendment.

Art Unit: 2178

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McWilliams et al. (Pat. # 5,906,397).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Director United States Patent and Trademark Office

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

- (703) 746-7238, (for **After Final** communications intended for entry)
- (703) 746-7239, (for **Formal** communications intended for entry, **except formal After Final communications**)

Or:

- (703) 746-7240, (for **Informal or Draft** communications for discussion only, please label **“PROPOSED”** or **“DRAFT”**).

Application/Control Number: 09/330,056

Page 7

Art Unit: 2178

**Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).**

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Cesar B Paula". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial 'C'.

CESAR B PAULA

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2178

6/30/03